

Page 6 10/733,622 LUC-441 Pfleging 5-3-10

Remarks

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 12 and 18 which have been rewritten without substantive amendment in independent format. Claims 1, 12 and 18 are pending.

Allowability

Independent claims 12 and 18 should be in condition for allowance since each has been rewritten in independent format and were indicated to contain allowable subject matter in the Office Action.

Specification Objections

The errors in the specification noted in the Office Action have been remedied by amendment and hence these objections are overcome.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 15 is canceled rendering moot the rejection under §112.

Claim Rejection of Claim 1 - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,807,463 (Cunningham). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended and now has similarities to independent claim 12. More specifically, a first sensor component generates a response that comprises a picture or sound captured by the first sensor component which the gateway component sends to the mobile communication

Page 7 10/733,622 LUC-441 Pfleging 5-3-10

device. Cunningham does not teach or suggest such a limitation. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Cunningham.

In the Office Action, Gaucher (US patent number 6, 405, 261) was combined with Cunningham to reject claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Gaucher was said to teach the use of voice-to-text conversion enabling a remote user to issue voice messages that would be converted into text commands that could enable actions to be taken by an appliance controlling device. It is believed that Gaucher does not teach or suggest the transmission of a sound captured by a sensor component to a remote user. Therefore, even considering Gaucher in combination with Cunningham, claim 1 is not rendered obvious.

Pursuant to MPEP 706.07(c), it would be inappropriate to make an Office Action final should new references or grounds be applied in support of a rejection of any of claims that have not been substantive amended.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at 630-584-9206.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles L. Warren
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,407

Dated: July 26, 2005

PATTI & BRILL, LLC
Customer Number 47382